

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/505,251	10/29/2004	Eva Binggeli	102790-179	7579
27389 7550 09/11/2008 NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS 875 THIRD AVE			EXAMINER	
			PRATT, HELEN F	
18TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/505,251 BINGGELI ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit Helen F. Pratt 1794 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2008. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-22 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-13, 15-22 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTC/G5/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ______

Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

6) Other:

Notice of Informal Patent Application

Art Unit: 1794

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior at are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1--8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schieberle (XP-002249876) or Berchtold et al. (WO 03/041515).

Schieberle (XP-002249876) disclose a process as in claim 1 of making treated sesame seeds by roasting sesame seeds, which contain 2-furfurylthiol. The reference discloses that roasting of the odorless sesame seeds generates an intense flavor (page 145, paragraphs 1-3).

Temperatures of 180 C for 30 minutes are disclosed as in claim 2 (page 145, paragraph 2).

Crushing the seeds is disclosed on page 147, para. 2. as in claim 3.

An extract and distillate is disclosed as in claims 4 and 5 using a hydrocarbon (page, 148).

The product is disclosed as in claims 4 and 5 and 6 and an extract thereof as in claim 7 (page 148).

Art Unit: 1794

A consumable or flavor preparation is seen to have been made as the composition is disclosed as above as in claims 6–8. The fact that the procedures of the reference are different than that of applicant is not a sufficient reason for allowing the product-by-process claims since the patentability of such claims is based upon the product formed and not the method by which it was produced. See In re Thorpe 227 USPQ 964. The burden is upon applicant to submit objective evidence to support their position as to the product-by-process claims. See Ex parte Jungfer 18 USPQ 2D 1796.

2-Furfurythiol (FFT) is disclosed as being made by the process of claim 1 (page 145, 1st col.) as in claims 12 and 15. Even though sesame seeds are not brassica seeds, the reference discloses how FFT is extracted and if heating seeds containing FFT develops the FFT, it would have been obvious to extract it from other seeds such as Brassica. An increase in the concentration of FFT of 100% is seen to have resulted as in claim 13, since before roasting the sesame seeds were odorless, but afterwards an intense flavor was developed (page 145, 1st para.).

The degree of concentration as in claims 16, 17, is seen to have been shown since the process has been shown as above. The product is considered to be a roasted brown material (page 147, 2nd. Para, page 148, 1and 2nd col.'s).

The product contains sesame seeds are from the family Brassica nigra as in claims 20 and 21.

Berchtold et al. disclose roasting seeds as in claim 1 from various families including cruciferum and brassica by continuously heating seeds to a predetermined

Art Unit: 1794

temperature (abstract). Times and temperatures as in claim 2 of up to 120 C for 10 minutes are disclosed on page 3, lines 14-18. The product is seen to have had a flavor modifying property since it was heated to within the claimed time as in claims 1 and 2 as shown in the specification. It is well known, that foods can be heated for various lengths of time, for longer times as shown by Berchtold et al. i. e. 10 minutes, or shorter times at higher temperatures as shown by the instant application. Nothing has been shown that heating sesame seeds for 10 minutes at the claimed temperatures would not have developed ff-2. .

Reducing the seeds or fragmenting them is disclosed on page 5, lines 15-20 as in claim 3.

Products are disclosed as in claims 6 and 7, as in claim 1 which is a whole or fragmented heat- treat seed as in claims 1-7 of the reference (page 10, lines 1-30).

The product is considered consumable as in claim 8 since that is the purpose of treating the seeds as in claim 8 (page 12, lines 15-20).

Furfurylthiol (2-FFT) is seen to be increased to 100 % as in claims 12, 13, 15 since the process of heating to the claimed temperature has been shown as in claims 1 and 2.

Claim 1 and the other pertinent claims have been amended to require a higher lower temperature of 160 C. However, nothing critical is seen in the specification as to using temperatures in the range of 120-250 C.(col. 2, lines 1-4). Even though sesame seeds are not Brassica seeds, they contain the same 2-furfurylthiol which is developed on heating. Since the chemical compound of 2-furfurylthio (2 ff) would be the same no

Art Unit: 1794

matter what type of seed was used, then heating it to temperatures within the claimed amount would develop the 2-fft. Therefore, it would have been obvious to treat other seeds containing 2ff with heat at even higher temperatures in order to develop 2-fft as to further treat as shown by the independent claims.

Claims 1-7, 12, 15, 16, 20, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vasundhara et al. (XP 009014888).

Vasundhara discloses that the mustard seed (Brassica Juncea Linn) can be roasted which brings about a flavor change as in claim 1, to a temperature of 120 C for about 2 hours (claim 2), and ground as in claim 3 (abstract, page 685, 3rd, page 686, para. 1). Claim 1 and the other pertinent claims have been amended to require a higher, lower temperature of 160 C. However, nothing critical is seen in the specification as to using temperatures in the range of 120-250 C.(col. 2, lines 1-4). Brassica seeds, contain the same 2-furfurylthiol which is developed on heating. Since the chemical compound of 2-furfurylthio (2 ff) would be the same no matter what type of seed was used, then heating it to temperatures within the claimed amount would develop the 2ff. Therefore, it would have been obvious to treat Brassica seeds containing 2ff with heat at even higher temperatures in order to develop 2-ff. as to further treat as shown by the independent claims.

An extract is made as in claim 4 from methylene chloride and steam distilled as in claim 5 (page 686, lines 4 and 5).

A roasted powder is made as in claim 6 which is extracted as in claim 7 (page 686, 1st para.).

Art Unit: 1794

FFT is formed as in claim 12 (page 691 1st para.). The product containing FFT is formed as in claim 15 and claim 16.

Brassium junea is disclosed as in claims 20 and 21.

Claims 9-11, 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schieberle (XP-002249876) or Berchtold et al. (WO 03/041515) or Vasundhara et al. as applied to claims 1--8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22 and further in view of Lynn (3,697,290).

Lynn discloses a non-elastic protein containing product where the protein is from seeds such as sesame seed meal or cotton seed or soybean meal. The composition containing the seeds is heated to from 300 to 350 F (148 C to 176). Sesame seeds are known to contain 2-fft as in Schieberle. Seeds as in claims 9 and 10 are used in large amounts and combining the seeds with a flavor imparting amount as in claim 11 is disclosed as the seeds are combined with other food ingredients (See examples). As it is known that the treated seeds are edible, it would have been obvious to use them in particular amounts for their known functions. FFT is seen to have been found in the food products of Lynn, since the composition is cooked twice to within the claimed heating range, which develops the FFT (col. 6, lines 30-70). The particular amount of FFT as in claims 16-20 is seen to have been within the skill of the ordinary worker, since it is known that these seeds generate FFT, and in cooking, one uses ingredients according to how they will make a product taste. Therefore, it would have been obvious

Art Unit: 1794

to use known ingredients which contain FFT for their known function of imparting flavoring and nutrition.

Claims 8-10 have been amended to require that the flavor has been produced by the process of claim 1. The fact that the procedures of the reference are different than that of applicant is not a sufficient reason for allowing the product-by-process claims since the patentability of such claims is based upon the product formed and not the method by which it was produced. See In re Thorpe 227 USPQ 964. The burden is upon applicant to submit objective evidence to support their position as to the product-by-process claims. See Ex parte Jungfer 18 USPQ 2D 1796. Therefore, no weight is given to the process of claim 1 in claim 9.

ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments filed 7-28-08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that it would have been impossible to know if 2-FFT will be formed before trying it out and whether the resulting treated seeds will have the flavor modifying properties as well. However, if it is known that a product contains the 2-fft, then it would have been obvious to roast other seeds containing the 2-FFt since the reference to Schieberle discloses this is how the 2-FFT is developed.

Applicants argue that Bertchold fails to teach treating within the newly claimed range. However, nothing critical is seen in treating at higher temperatures and the specification clearly discloses treating at 120 C. Certainly, it is known to treat for longer times at lower temperatures and less time at higher temperatures and Bertchold treats for 10 minutes at the lower temperature.

Art Unit: 1794

Applicants argue as to Vasundhara reference that Vasundhara does not teach 2-fft. However, the reference does disclose as in claim 1 roasting brassica seeds to within the claimed temperatures. Roasting develops sulfur containing compounds such as furfurylthiol. Furfural is disclosed on (page 691, 1st paragraph). If furfural can be detected nothing is seen that 2-furfurylthiol would not have been in the product as a volatile. Vasundhara discloses that roasting brown mustard produces six sulfur compounds and 2-fft is known to be one.

Applicants argue that even though Ott discloses the flavor compound 2-fft, the reference does not disclose products containing Brassica seeds treated according to the process of claim 1. However, claim 9 is a composition claim, dependent on claim 8 which is also a composition claim. As above no weight is given to how the product is produced in a composition claim.

The combined references provide basis for Ott to determine that 2-FFT would have flavor enhancing properties since they show the method of making 2-FFT.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1794

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helen F. Pratt whose telephone number is 571-272-1404. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Keith Hendricks, can be reached on 571-272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Helen F Pratt/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

9-5-08